



STATE OF INDIANA

MITCHELL E. DANIELS, JR., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Procurement Division

402 W Washington Street, Room W468

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

317 / 232-3053

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: July 18, 2011

To: Nicole Kenney, Deputy Commissioner of Procurement
Indiana Department of Administration *NK*

From: Steve Webb, Strategic Sourcing Analyst
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 11-73
Solicitation for E-rate Filing and Consulting Services for the Indiana Department
of Education (IDOE)

Estimated Amount of 3-year Contract: \$274,800.00

Based on the evaluation of our team, we recommend for selection **AdTec** to begin contract negotiations to provide E-rate Filing and Consulting Services for the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE). Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received proposals from four (4) vendors:

- AdTec
- E-rate Central
- E-rate Elite Services
- ERMS

The proposals were evaluated by IDOE and IDOA according to the following criteria established in the RFP:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (25 points)
- Pricing Proposal (30 points)
- Indiana Economic Impact (15 points)
- Buy Indiana/Indiana Company (10 points)
- Minority-Owned Business Participation (10 points)
- Woman-Owned Business Participation (10 points)

The proposals were evaluated according to the process outlined in section 3.2 ("Evaluation Criteria") of the RFP.

Scoring was completed as follows:

A. Adherence to Requirements

All proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. All respondents met these requirements and were then evaluated based on the business proposal, technical proposal, and cost proposal.

B. Management Assessment/Quality

Business Proposal

For the business proposal evaluation, the team considered each respondent's proposal for:

- References

Technical Proposal

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered each respondent's proposal for:

- Collecting information from schools
- Form 471 filing process
- Form 486 filing process
- Communication plan with the E-rate Coordinator
- Additional consultation needs
- Support for PIA requests

The evaluation team's scores were based on a review of each respondent's proposed approach to each section of the technical proposal, Section 2.4, as well as specific questions that respondents were asked to respond to in the RFP and clarifications.

Results of the management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: MAQ Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (25 Max)
AdTec	23.39
E-rate Central	20.36
E-rate Elite Services	17.56
ERMS	14.52

During business and technical proposal evaluation, the evaluation team observed the following regarding each respondent. This is not intended to be an exhaustive discussion of what the evaluation team considered, but attempts to highlight some of the primary considerations that led to the evaluation team's scores.

AdTec

AdTec scored 23.39 points out of the possible 25 qualitative points. As the incumbent service provider, the AdTec proposal leveraged the company knowledge of the Indiana context to propose a range of consultation services that will benefit the state. AdTec also proposed a cap on direct filing related expenses as an added value in a climate in which the number of state supporting filings could very well increase. AdTec proposed a thorough and sufficient plan for communication with the state E-rate Coordinator—a balance that was lacking in the other proposals.

E-rate Central

E-rate Central scored 20.36 points out of the possible 25 qualitative points. It was clear that the E-rate Central team had done some homework regarding Indiana's history of filing, but the team expressed some concern about the communication plan with the state E-rate Coordinator. The response is thorough, but some of the work proposed would simply be unnecessary in the Indiana context.

E-rate Elite Services

E-rate Elite Services scored 17.56 points out of the possible 25 qualitative points. While the proposal presents a viable filing service, the review team felt that if the typographical errors found in the proposal translated to filing the form 471s there would be an adverse effect on school internet discounts. The proposed consulting services fell short in comparison with the competition.

ERMS

ERMS scored 14.52 points out of the possible 25 qualitative points. The ERMS proposal represented several changes in approach to the current way that schools are supported through the E-rate filing process. Completing the filing 2 weeks prior to the Form 471 deadline is interesting, but would not include any last minute consumption. The ERMS proposal did not strike the right balance of communication with the State E-rate coordinator and consulting on matters related to E-rate filing from a state level.

C. Cost Proposal

Price is measured against the state's baseline cost for this scope of work. Cost scoring points will be assigned as follows:

- Respondents who meet the state's current baseline cost will receive zero (0) cost points.
- Respondents who propose a decrease to the state's current costs will receive positive points at the same rate as bid increasing cost.
- Respondents who propose an increase to the state's current cost will receive negative points at the same rate as bid lowering cost.
- Respondents who propose a 10% decrease to the state's current baseline cost will receive all of the available cost points.
- If multiple respondents decrease costs below 10% of the current baseline, an additional 5 points will be added to the respondent proposing the lowest cost to the state.

All respondents were given the opportunity to improve their pricing through a round of target pricing, and all respondents provided pricing that will be beneficial to the state. The scoring for step 2 of the evaluation process is outlined below:

Table 2: Cost Scores

RESPONDENT	COST SCORE (-30 to +30)
AdTec	30.00
E-rate Central	30.00
E-rate Elite Services	30.00
ERMS	35.00

Combined final Business Proposal, Technical Proposal, and Cost Proposal scores were as follows:

Table 3: MAQ/Cost Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (25 Max)	COST SCORE (-30 to +30)	ROUND SCORE (55)
AdTec	23.39	30.00	53.39
E-rate Central	20.36	30.00	50.36
E-rate Elite Services	17.56	30.00	47.56
ERMS	14.52	35.00	49.52

D. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the four respondents in the following areas – Buy Indiana (10 points), Indiana Economic Impact (15 points), and Minority and Women Business Participation (10 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain Buy Indiana, Indiana Economic Impact, and Minority and Women Business Participation information with the respondents. Once the final MWBE and IEI forms were received from respondents, the total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated, and are as follows:

Table 4: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

RESPONDENT	MAQ SCORE (25 max)	COST SCORE (30 max)	BUY INDIANA (10 max)	IEI (15 max)	MBE (10 max)	WBE (10 max)	TOTAL SCORE (100 max)
AdTec	23.39	30.00	10	15.00	-1.0	-1.0	76.39
E-rate Central	20.36	30.00	0	0.00	-1.0	-1.0	48.36
E-rate Elite Services	17.56	30.00	0	6.90	10.0	10.0	74.46
ERMS	14.52	35.00	0	0.00	-1.0	-1.0	47.52

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the state scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions to meet the goals of the program and to meet the needs of the state. The team evaluated proposals based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP document.

This agreement will be for a period of three (3) years.

Signed By:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "John B. Keller". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Dr. John Keller
Indiana Department of Education
RFP 11-73 Evaluation Team

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Steve Webb". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Steve Webb
Indiana Department of Administration